

## EVALUATION

### ***Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013***

---

<b>Applicant</b>	Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority (SAWPA)	<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$ 16,667,000
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Santa Ana One Water One Watershed IRWM Prop 84, Round 2 Implementation Proposal	<b>Total Proposal Cost</b>	\$ 194,426,052

---

#### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The proposal includes the following 20 projects: (A) Perris Desalination Program, Brackish Water Wells 94, 95, 96; (B) Quail Valley Subarea 9 Phase 1 Sewer System Project; (C) Forest First - Increase Stormwater Capture and Decrease Sediment Loading Through Forest Ecological Restoration; (D) Wineville Regional Recycled Water Pipeline and Groundwater Recharge System Upgrades; (E) Plunge Creek Water Recharge and Habitat Improvement; (F) Prado Basin Sediment Management Demonstration Project; (G) San Sevaine Groundwater Recharge Basin; (H) Corona/Home Gardens Well Rehabilitation and Multi-Jurisdictional Water Transmission Line Project; (I) Enhanced Stormwater Capture and Recharge along the Santa Ana River; (J) Regional Residential Landscape Retrofit Program; (K) Canyon Lake Hybrid Treatment Process; (L) 14th Street Groundwater Recharge and Stormwater Quality Treatment Integration Facility; (M) Customer Handbook to Using Water Efficiently in the Landscape; (N) Vulcan Pit Flood Control and Aquifer Recharge Project; (O) Francis Street Storm Drain and Ely Basin Flood Control and Aquifer Recharge Project; (P) Commercial/Industrial/Institutional Performance-Based Water Use Efficiency Program; (Q) Peters Canyon Channel Water Capture and Reuse Pipeline; (R) Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians Wastewater Project; (S) Recycled Water Project Phase I (Arlington-Central Avenue Pipeline); and (T) Wilson III Basins Project and Wilsons Basins/Spreading Grounds.

#### **PROPOSAL SCORE**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score/ Max. Possible</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score/ Max. Possible</b>
Work Plan	9/15	Technical Justification	6/10
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	2/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	15/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	4/10
<b>Total Score (max. possible = 80)</b>			<b>42</b>

## **EVALUATION SUMMARY**

### **WORK PLAN**

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The applicant does not clearly define the project goals and objectives. For some projects, task descriptions and deliverables are missing. In addition, the work plan does not contain a discussion of the synergies or linkages among projects; it is unclear how the projects are linked. Many of the project tasks contain inadequate detail. For example, Project C does not include submission of quarterly reports; tasks 4 and 5 are not tasks but appear to be sections from NEPA documentation and do not provide defined deliverables. Project D construction tasks contain no description of work performed. Project I task descriptions lack sufficient detail, do not list potential permits, and do not list any deliverables. Project J tasks do not list any deliverables and lack adequate detail. Project R tasks lack sufficient detail; contain no deliverables and no construction task for the proposed waste water treatment facility. Among the least detailed, projects G and L possess no description of work for any task. Many of the projects do not contain tasks for all of the budget categories. As a result it is not clear that some of the projects can be fully implemented.

### **BUDGET**

Budgets for more than half of the projects in the proposal have detailed cost information, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the budget categories. A summary budget is provided for the proposal and individual budgets are subsequently also provided for each project. However, for a majority of the projects the applicant does not supply cost estimates at the task level but rather supplies cost estimates at the budget category level. Supporting cost documentation or explanation is missing for most projects, and few projects have sufficient information to verify if the costs are reasonable. Much of the backup documentation supplied is based off of staff/labor time estimates, which are not accompanied with an explanation of how these estimations were considered beyond “extensive experience” with managing State and Federal grant programs.

### **SCHEDULE**

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. All of the projects demonstrate a readiness to begin prior to October 2014. However, because the schedule does not demonstrate consistency with the tasks listed in the work plan, it cannot be determined whether the attachment is reasonable as it relates to the work plan. In addition, some of the individual projects do not illustrate enough detail to demonstrate that the schedule is reasonable and many of the projects do not exhibit quarterly reporting throughout the duration of the project. In most cases, project schedule tasks are inconsistent with the work plan tasks. For example, projects C and D schedule project design and solicitation after construction start and end dates. Several other projects have tasks with no beginning or ending date. In some cases the evaluation and assessment tasks end before the project is complete or at the same time; this does not permit sufficient time for the task, particularly for projects involving groundwater recharge. In the case of Project J and a few others there is no schedule for assessment and evaluation.

### **MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Not all applicable targets have been quantified to determine whether they can be met over the lifetime of the project. Furthermore, the submittal lacks sufficient detail and narrative to ascertain if measurement tools and methods will effectively monitor project performance and target progress. Some projects contain minimal information to support the measures. The proposed targets appear technically feasible within the life of the project yet the submittal lacks sufficient documentation to support. For example, Project B where the source of the “zero discharge” is not identified and sewer hookups are not part of the project; Project C where goals are not consistent with those in the project description, variability in fire events may make event comparisons impractical as a measurement tool/method, on-site

sediment tracking is impractical, and several performance indicators are unrelated to the goal; Project F where goals don't match goals stated in the project description, performance indicators are not stated in a quantifiable and verifiable manner, and necessary baseline information is not proposed. Project E appears to be missing some needed information within the provided table.

#### **TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION**

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the projects and/or physical benefits are not well described. Although some projects include a detailed analysis, some do not include a summary table of physical benefits as required by the PSP (p.40). Project L has limited information and only includes references to other attachments of submittal. Project M does not include a narrative that clearly identifies and describes the claimed physical benefits and only includes copies of reference material. Project R is a study and therefore no physical benefits are claimed. Project S does not include an annual benefit summary for with- and without- project. Deficiencies include inconsistent units for calculating tons or metric tons of avoided CO2 emissions; presumptions of zero baseline recharge for many of the recharge projects; and omitted runoff losses in calculating recharge volume.

#### **BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS**

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. As a whole, how the proposed projects fit into the existing infrastructure and how benefits would be obtained is not clearly described. The claims of physical benefits cannot, for most projects, be verified by the documentation provided. For some projects, no documentation for benefits claimed is provided. There are numerous inconsistencies involving calculations of hydrology, water supply and flood damage reduction, and double-counting and even triple-counting of benefits for some projects.

#### **PROGRAM PREFERENCES**

Applicant claims that six program preferences and eight statewide priorities will be met by implementing the projects. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for three of the preferences claimed: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; and (3) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region. For the preference "Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region identified in the CWP; RWQCB region or subdivision; or other region or sub-region specifically identified by DWR" the applicant claims but does not adequately explain how all the selective projects will be effectively integrated within their identified region. For the preference "Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions" the applicant does not identify or define a specific conflict or purport to effectively to resolve one. For the preference "Effectively integrate water management with land use planning" projects were consistent with existing land use or integration was not adequately explained.